

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey Administration

Date: May 8, 2018

Members Present: Dr. Buckley, Patrick Walton, Dr. Hall, Dave Clausen

Members Absent: Karissa Morehouse, Dr. Shuntay Taylor

Planning Section

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College? It is collegial. Each group has input. It is transparent, systematic, and effective part of the planning and budget process. It is part of the accreditation process.
2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College? The lack of understanding of who makes the final decision. The lack of communication to the constituent groups. The communication needs to be better disseminated to the group members.
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness? Having the master planning chairs meet regularly
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks? Director of Institutional Effectiveness needed. The Database needs to be easily accessible.

Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process? All the groups are at the table but more student participation is needed. The governance training was excellent this year. There is a great working relationship between the Academic Senate and the Administration.
2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process? There is a need for a Classified Senate. More student participation is needed.
3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution? There is a need for a task list for budgetary items.

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey LCC Associated Student Body

Date: 5/7/18

Members Present: Jacob Hibbitts, Andrae Grace, Connor Skudstad, Emily Detrick, Tatiana Ybarra, Madison Brown

Members Absent:

Planning Section

5. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?
There is opportunity for discussion in close quarters. Advocacy flourishes in a small environment.
6. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?
*The process can take a long time. It can be cumbersome.
Not having students present on all planning committees.*
7. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
Incentives for students to participate on committees. Examples could include stipends.
8. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
Data on students groups, demographics, and success rates to better serve the student body.

Governance Section

4. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
Opportunity is given to all to be present at governance bodies.
5. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
Training for students on what is shared governance and the benefits of participating.
6. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?
*Leadership training for students.
Changing the vote of the student trustee from an advisory vote to an official vote.*

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey CSEA Classified Chapter #591

Date: 5/10/2018

Members Present: Members present at our 5/10/18 Chapter Meeting

Members Absent:

Planning Section

9. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - *Each Constituent Group Is Represented*
 - *We have the opportunity to put in our input.*

10. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - *Follow Through*
 - *Lack of Communication/Lack of Completion*
 - *Spending Without Going Through Proper Processes*

11. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - *Hire A Director of Institutional Effectiveness*
 - *Enforce The Same Rules for Everyone/Every Department*
 - *Too Many Hands In The Pie- Tends to Hold Things Up*

12. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
 - *Research Data- Cannot Complete IPR's*

Governance Section

7. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
 - *All Groups Are Represented*

8. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
 - *Administration Needs to Show Up Prepared*
 - *Administration needs to be more transparent and follow the process.*
 - *List & Prioritize/Finish All Uncompleted Projects*

9. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?
- *Review All Unfinished Projects*
 - *Figure out what \$ amount it will take to finish all projects.*
 - *Have An Updated Shared Governance Handbook*

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey Faculty

Date: May 8, 2018

Members Present: Richard Swanson, Barbara Baston, Lisa Gardiner, Roxanna Haynes, Jeff Owens, Sue Mouck

Members Absent: Cheryl Aschenbach (contributed via email)

Planning Section

13. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?
We have a well-established process.
14. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - a. *Faculty were not given a program review orientation (including instructions or support relate to data and surveys required within a program review), which makes it difficult to 1) know that an IPR is due this year and 2) complete a data-supported program review. (an institutional researcher would facilitate data gathering).*
 - b. *Communication re: who has program reviews, how to do them, and where to find the support material needed. Faculty are left on their own to figure it out with only a little senate support (no Academic Affairs or Institutional Effectiveness Support as is mentioned in the IPR Handbook)*
15. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - a. *Have an Institutional Effectiveness position who produces the research and an initial analysis for faculty to include in their program reviews.*
 - b. *Conduct an orientation like is called for in the IPR Handbook (Information about "Qlik.")*
 - c. *Have the District support annual program reviews (brief) to make the 2-yr and 4-yr IPRs a little easier to do and to better ensure current and relevant input of priorities into the budget and planning process.*
 - d. *New faculty orientation is vital to communication and institutional effectiveness. Perhaps this could take the form of a new employee orientation conducted by the Senate president. Governance and Planning relies on communication.*
16. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc.) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
 - a. *Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Research – this position is supposed to drive the program review process as well as the budget and planning process*

- b. Classified support for Dir of IE; an analyst or similar position could produce a preliminary analysis of collected data which could then be further explained by faculty.*

Governance Section

- 10. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
 - a. The faculty have a strong voice with an experienced Senate president.*
 - b. Faculty are being appointed by the Academic Senate and participating throughout the committee structure.*

- 11. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
 - a. At times, it feels as if the college president “consults collegially” through Consultation Council but already has his mind made up. No feedback is given to Consultation Council when actions are different than recommendations that arise from the consultation process*
 - b. The consultative process, including budgeting and planning processes, are undermined when single faculty or staff members lobby administration to get their desired result regardless of whether there was broader input or not*

- 12. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?
 - a. No*

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey Management Group

Date: 5/3/18

Members Present: Terry Bartley, Melissa Hill, David Corley, Nathan Jersey, Michell Williams, Chrisdee Pelfrey, Davis Murphy, Fran Oberg, Amy Langslet, Vickie Ramsey, Paige Broglio, Greg Collins

Members Absent: Bridgett Gowin, Eric Imrie, Carol Growden, Julie Johnston, Francis Beaujon

Planning Section

17. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?

- *Broad participation*
- *Master Planning Chairs meeting together but should be meet more frequently and earlier in the process.*

18. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?

- *A need for more education, sometimes individuals are confused and assume decisions rather than recommendations are made at the participatory level.*
- *Constant turnover with EMP being first, many times it puts the process behind so having the chairs meet could help that person get up to speed faster.*
- *Additional training is still needed to help especially new people to learn what the process and roles of the individual are.*
- *Communicate the format better, maybe a master plan template so that every plan does look the same.*
- *The planning doesn't seem to complete the loop there is still confusion on the CIMP, what made it in what didn't, what was accomplished what did not. What is our plan for the year.*
- *Trying to get commitment from the appointees to a committee so something can get accomplished. It would be helpful if there were multiple alternates attached to the committees and communicated to the chairs so they are aware so meetings are cancelled less often.*

19. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

- *NIPR and IPR should be relatively easy to complete so finding out the barriers to this process to insure more timely participation without eliminating effective data. More is not usually better.*

- *Template for the Master Plans maybe with an update chart as members are meeting that can be used for the plans that were coming later so they could get a head start on what other plans are discussing.*
 - *Communicate the CIMP maybe during convocation of the year we are supposed to be implementing the plans.*
 - *Maybe setting up calendars before appointments to the committees occur so that people can decide if they have free time to commit.*
 - *Meeting times are difficult to set to accommodate everyone's schedule.*
20. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
- *Identify resources and support in completing planning processes, some may need more help than others. Someone to shepherd the process to tailor whatever resource the individual needs to assist timely submissions.*
 - *Research person needed.*

Governance Section

13. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
- *Consultation council seemed to run much smoother and was more collegial.*
 - *There is a perception that consultation council has been the place where shared governance occurs the most but if master plan chairs meet more often, it could expand out those shared ideas.*
14. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
- *More buy in and transparency with different groups, using the Team site more*
 - *Communicate more information such as dates for meetings so they can be posted.*
 - *Link agendas to the meeting dates so someone who is interested can see what is being discussed.*
 - *Training Master Plan chairs on the process such as posting minutes from the meetings by sending them to IT so they are available to all.*
 - *Helping committees to understand their charge so that they can stay on topic. Make sure what the charge is and is it still appropriate. Maybe a Training for the Master Plan chairs to remind them of what the committee charge is for the year as part of the review from the CIMP so we are not changing direction so often.*
15. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?
- *Identifying how to work on emergency/emergent needs.*

- *Make it a policy that items to be prioritized are not included unless there has been justification no older than two years. Items older are cut out and if it is still valid then you should be completing an update to your NIPR/IPR annually or at least every two years and reprioritizing and including your needs.*
- *Requiring annual updates from everyone.*

**Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance
Process Review
Planning Committee Survey
Academic Master Planning Committee**

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Facilities Planning Committee

Date: May 11, 2018

Members Present: Greg Collins, Karen Clancy, Christopher Baker

Members Absent: Ross Brosius, Carol Growdon, Francis Beaujon

Submitted via email: Cindy Howe, Patrick Clancy

Planning Section

21. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - *The Initial plan*
 - *Good Member Interaction (Members have experience in committee subject matter)*
 - *Having a detailed strategic plan*
 - *Having a Master Plan (Staying focuses on main goal)*
 - *Committee Chair Meetings to help the budgeting process at Consultation Counsel.*
 - *Having a clear focused agenda*

22. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - *People with no background have input and it slows down the process. This creates a bottle neck in the planning to the execution stage. Would suggest having committee members that are actually interested in Facilities on campus*
 - *Time of meetings*
 - *Not having a 10year/20year/30year plan for facilities upkeep*

23. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - *There needs to be away to expedite the shared governance process with decisions made by departments and administration*
 - *Better time for meetings- late in the day after classes are over (3pm and later)*
 - *More Communication & better attendance at meetings.*
 - *Have Less Cancelled meetings*
 - *Use surveys for input or suggestions*
 - *Use Doodle to schedule meetings*
 - *Use themes for meetings for next year (i.e. Student Life, Building improvement, emergency projects)*
 - *Plan to be proactive not reactive*
 - *Timing of projects be based on the Master Plan (focus should be to benefit the campus as a whole not based on personal politics)*

24. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?

- *We need a better vetting process before it gets to a committee*
- *Clerical Support*
- *Use better planning of meetings*
- *Assigned alternate committee members to attend meeting if chosen committee member cannot attend.*
- *Getting other planning committees to be timely so Facilities planning Committee does not have to complete theirs at the last minute.*
- *Transparency*
- *Create a physical Master Plan*
- *Have NIPR's updated to reflect annually*

Governance Section

16. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?

- *Information getting out to all constituent groups*
- *Everyone on the committee gets a voice*
- *Is this working?*

17. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?

- *Better communication between all levels*
- *Bottle neck effect with budget process (How much money can committees have a direct decision on?)*
- *Help establish priority of Health & Safety (emergency projects)*
- *Each committee member should have a common good attitude*
- *Better Transparency of meeting outcomes*

18. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?

- *Have a capital improvement, catastrophic budget*
- *Prioritizing Life Safety improvements*
- *Complete emergency issues before having new projects*

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Human Resources Planning Committee

Date: May 8, 2018

Members Present: Completed via email.

Members Absent:

Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited to the work of planning committees (Academic Planning, Student Services Planning, Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Institutional Technology Planning, Facility Planning, Human Resource Planning etc.) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs and analysis of student learning and administrative unit outcome results.

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - *Every person is assigned a committee so people have the opportunity to participate.*
2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - *Too much paperwork.*
 - *Not always getting all the information about changes (State regulations, Ed Code and how LCC implements those changes).*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - *The information is too convoluted. Monthly summary by Administration would be helpful.*
 - *Process needs to be streamlined and prioritized.*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc.) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
 - *Need data on trainings employees have taken.*
 - *Need employees to know that they need to take training especially on an annual basis.*
 - *We need professional development money campus wide!!!! Correct direction for the committees. What does the committee need to accomplish. Training and universal format for IPR and NIPRs as well as committee plan. Having a universal format for our committee plans as we do with NIPR and IPRs so it is easier to pull information needed from NIPRs and IPRs.*
5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes for accreditation purposes.*

6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes and No.*

Governance Section

1. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
 - *Yes, in 2017 and No in 2018.*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
 - *Updated EEO Plan, HR Master Plan and Professional Development Plan.*
 - *Presented new Recruiting Guide and suggested changes to the ever-ongoing Employee Handbook.*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *N/A*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? *Yes.*
If not what changes are needed? *None*
5. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.
 - *All groups were represented more than 50% at each meeting.*
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
 - *Having the plan and discussion of the plans during Convocation.*

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Planning Committee Survey Institutional Effectiveness Master Planning Committee

Committee Name: IEMP

Date: May 10th, 2018

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Emily Broderick, Dr. Shuntay Taylor, Michell Williams, Codi Mortell, David Corley, Logan Merchant, Robert Schofield, and Bridget Gowin

Members Absent: None

Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited to the work of planning committees (Academic Planning, Student Services Planning, Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Institutional Technology Planning, Facility Planning, Human Resource Planning etc.) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs and analysis of student learning and administrative unit outcome results.

7. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - *Process, when it's followed.*
 - *Campus evaluation is valued and revisions have been made to the process over the years as a result.*
 - *Having meetings of planning committee chairs helped with format and communication during the process*
 - *The planning process itself. LCC is good at planning.*

8. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?
 - *Without a Dir of IE, there isn't anyone to shepherd the process and provide the data needed for program reviews*
 - *Timelines have not been met*
 - *Because data interpretation is not consistent, it is difficult to set resource allocation priorities for current and future goals*
 - *Data from program reviews missing so it's difficult to set priorities.*

9. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - *Explore possibility of moving timelines out a couple of weeks or so to help give AMPC a little more time to get EMP finished in fall, then continue to have other plans follow. But, consider having more plans worked on simultaneously (as with SSMP, ITMP) to allow the process to start a little bit later.*

- *Have more governance trainings for new employees. Committee trainings so members know goals and expectations of committees.*
 - *Hold departments that do not complete their IPRs on time accountable.*
 - *Hold IPR and NIPR trainings.*
10. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc.) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
- *A Dir of IE and a research analyst are need to help shepherd and provide the info & support needed*
11. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *For the most part, yes*
12. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued?
- *By those involved on IEPC and Consultation Council, yes. By those on the rest of campus, we don't think so.*

Governance Section

7. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
8. Identify results (products) of committee activities? *IEMP*
9. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *None*
10. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? *Yes.*
If not what changes are needed? *None needed*
11. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings. *All groups were consistently represented.*
12. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
- *We need the Director of IE to help be a voice for the committee in meeting like consultation.*
 - *Distribute minutes via email to campus community.*
 - *Committee meeting schedule posted on campus calendar.*
 - *By creating a shared portal and or a canvas course per committee. The canvas course provides users the opportunity to participate in Discussion Board Forum, view announcements, and upload documents.*

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Planning Committee Survey Institutional Technology Planning Committee

Date: 5/11/2018 – completed via email

Members: David Corley, Dave Clausen, James Kleckner, Julie Wedemeyer, Jackson, Ng, Sharlene Murphy, Julie Johnston, Cathy Harrison, Jennifer Tupper

Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited to the work of planning committees (Academic Planning, Student Services Planning, Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Institutional Technology Planning, Facility Planning, Human Resource Planning etc.) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs and analysis of student learning and administrative unit outcome results.

13. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?

- *In general, participation from all members from the committee, are desiring positive change and action. The conversations are intelligent and diligent.*
- *Information from the EMP and SSMP feed into the ITMP.*
- *All constituent groups are represented*

14. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?

- *We are a small campus, so when administrators are not present meetings are cancelled and it delays the process. Meetings that are postponed or cancelled delay the planning. The fact that our college teaches on Fridays is an issue. It is becoming more difficult to plan meetings. If nobody had Friday classes, then we could always meet on Fridays. I will be teaching on Friday's next Fall so it will be more difficult to schedule our meetings.*
- *EMP and SSMP were not completed on time so it made the ITMP late as well.*
- *There seems to be a problem with actually planning major projects, so the cost is known, manpower is scheduled and a timeline for completion is stated and met. We have many unfinished projects, many of which don't seem to have gone through the planning or consultation process.*

15. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

- *I would e-mail and text all committee members if the meeting time has changed or if it was cancelled. I would try to re-schedule the meeting ASAP so that the priorities of each committee are not delayed. I would also not have classes taught on Fridays.*
- *While there will always be unanticipated “emergency” projects which will need to be completed, non-emergency projects (those which do not involve a*

safety issue or the functioning of the facilities on campus) should not be started before they have gone through the planning process.

16. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc.) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
- *I think the tasks can always be met if we had no classes on Fridays in terms of the committee. In terms of the broader question of what we need to meet the needs of our students, we need more employees in general both classified and certificated. More funding for building improvements, materials, and education supplies are always needed.*
17. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes.*
18. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes.*

Governance Section

13. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes.*
14. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
- *Passed results from our committee to other committees to determine our technology needs for LCC which was incorporated into the master plan.*
 - *Completed ITMP*
 - *Completed Security Cameras BP & AP and forwarded for approval.*
15. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *None needed.*
16. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *Yes.*
17. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.
- *Everyone participates. I can't think of anyone not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.*
18. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
- *Utilize e-mail and text to communicate.*
 - *Regular Master Planning Chairs meetings starting at the beginning of the school year.*
 - *I think the minutes for our meeting should be sent out the LCC everyone, not just the committee*

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Planning Committee Survey Student Services Master Planning Committee

Date: 5/10/2018

Members Present: Heather DelCarlo, Adam Runyan, Davis Murphy, Nathan Jersey, Patrick Walton

Members Absent: Jeff Owens, Karissa Morehouse, Andy Rupley, Sandy Beckwith, Carol Montgomery, Brandy Gonzalez

Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited to the work of planning committees (Academic Planning, Student Services Planning, Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Institutional Technology Planning, Facility Planning, Human Resource Planning etc.) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs and analysis of student learning and administrative unit outcome results.

19. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?

- *Regularity of meetings*
- *Communication*
- *It is a priority for different constituent groups to meet and collaborate the needs of the campus.*
- *This year, there seemed to be an even greater focus with inviting the president of the Academic Senate for CCC, the president of the CC League of California, and the president of Shasta to discuss specifically Shared Governance.*

20. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?

- *I think the process works, but I believe that new employees are not oriented well into how shared governance works and affects them.*
- *We have issues with execution. We plan well but lack follow through.*

21. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

- *Removing outdated items on the prioritization list. Need a live spreadsheet to actually track the progress of items.*
- *I believe that orientation needs to occur for new employees regarding shared governance.*

22. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc.) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?

- *We need a researcher hired immediately to be able to give us accurate data which will help us with informed decision making.*

23. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes*

24. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes*

Governance Section

19. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*

20. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

- *SSMP*
- *Integrated Plan*
- *End of the Year Evaluation*

21. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *N/A*

22. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?

- *Have a student attending the committee meetings.*

23. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.

- *A student.*
- *Carol Montgomery*
- *Sandy Beckwith*

24. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?

- *Continue with Master Planning Chairs meetings*
- *Members appointed to Master Planning Committees need better avenues for reporting back to constituency groups. More frequent meetings between faculty and management groups specifically.*
- *Get updates from all of the planning committees and provide explanations as to why certain items are not prioritized.*